

University of Groningen

Multiculturalism among minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands

Verkuyten, Maykel; Thijs, Jochem

Published in:
International Journal of Intercultural Relations

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2002

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Multiculturalism among minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26(1), 91.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



PERGAMON

International Journal of Intercultural Relations
26 (2002) 91–108

International Journal of
INTERCULTURAL
RELATIONS

www.elsevier.com/locate/ijintrel

Multiculturalism among minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands

Maykel Verkuyten*, Jochem Thijs

Faculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 2, 3584 CS Utrecht, Netherlands

Abstract

The extent of culture maintenance by ethnic minority groups and their adaptation to majority group culture are two issues central to everyday thinking about multiculturalism. Using Social Identity Theory and a two-dimensional acculturation model as theoretical frameworks, the present study examines the attitudes of Dutch and Turkish adolescents in the Netherlands. Turkish adolescents were strongly in favor of culture maintenance, which was not seen to be contradictory to adaptation. In contrast, the Dutch were less in favor of culture maintenance and more in favor of adaptation, and saw these issues as mutually exclusive. In addition, among the Turks ethnic identification was positively related to culture maintenance and was not related to adaptation. Among the Dutch, identification was related negatively to culture maintenance and positively to adaptation. Furthermore, the perception and interpretation of responsibility for group discrimination affected the Turks views on multiculturalism. Agreement with cultural adaptation was lowest, among Turkish participants who strongly identified with their ethnic background as well as attributed discrimination to the out-group. © 2002 Published by Elsevier Science Ltd.

Keywords: Multiculturalism; Attitude; Discrimination; Ethnicity; Adolescents; Netherlands

1. Introduction

Most societies around the world are, or are rapidly becoming, multicultural. The numerous questions posed by this situation affect fields as diverse as politics, health care, and education to name a few. Questions on the desirability and possibility of a multicultural society are a topic of debate and discussion. What is unclear, however, is what is meant by such a society, and how people from the groups in question think about such matters. Majority group people, for

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 + 302-525-559.

E-mail address: mverkuyten@fss.uu.nl (M. Verkuyten).

example, may stress the desirability or necessity of the assimilation of ethnic minorities to the dominant culture. Ethnic minorities, on the other hand, may emphasize their own identity and the necessity of culture maintenance. Such a difference of opinion will affect mutual expectations and inter-ethnic relations. However, relatively little is known about the existence of such a difference. Compared to the numerous writings and discussions about multicultural societies, there is very little empirical research (e.g. Horenczyk, 1996; van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998; Taylor & Lambert, 1996).

The present study, focuses on ethnically Dutch and Turkish adolescents living in the Netherlands. Studying multicultural issues among adolescents is important. It can improve our knowledge of the way this coming generation develops an understanding and evaluation of multicultural societies. Turks are the second largest ethnic minority group living in the Netherlands and their Islamic culture is considered to differ substantially from Dutch culture (Hagendoorn & Hraba, 1989). Our central question is whether and to what extent conceptions of the multicultural society differ between these two groups of young people, particularly in relation to issues of culture maintenance and cultural adaptation. We also relate these issues to ethnic identification and the extent to which in-group members are considered themselves to be discriminated against, and how group discrimination is explained.

According to Social Identity Theory (SIT: Tajfel & Turner, 1986), threat to group identity is an important factor to consider in examining group attitudes and behavior. Social identity threats can take different forms and responses to threat depend on the degree of group identification (see Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). Dutch people often see ethnic minorities and their desire to maintain their own culture as a threat (van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Prins, 1996). Especially Dutch people who feel committed to their group may see the presence of ethnic minorities as a threat to Dutch society and Dutch culture. In contrast, ethnic minorities may conceive cultural adaptation as a threat to their group identity. This is especially likely when the majority group is perceived to discriminate against minority groups, and for minority group members who identify strongly with their group.

Hence, SIT offers a theoretical framework for examining conceptions of the multicultural society. In addition Berry's (1980) model of acculturation is an influential and useful framework for examining issues of cultural maintenance and cultural adaptation. In the present research, both frameworks were used for making specific predictions.

2. Forms of acculturation

According to Berry (1980) every ethnically heterogeneous society needs to attend to two central issues. First, the extent to which ethnic minority groups value and desire the maintenance of their cultural features should be determined, and second, the extent to which adaptation and contacts with the majority group are considered

important. The positions people take on these issues imply different conceptions of the place of minority groups within that society (Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997). Proponents of assimilation have a negative attitude towards the first issue and a positive attitude towards the second. For them culture maintenance and adaptation are more or less contradictory options. This view relies on a one-dimensional model, in which the maintenance of minority culture implies the rejection of majority culture, and vice versa. The use of such a one-dimensional model is to be expected among members of the majority group in particular. In general, they can see an emphasis on culture maintenance by minority groups as a form of rejection and a threat to majority culture (Baron & Byrne, 1997; Oudenhoven et al., 1998).

For ethnic minorities the situation is different. For them, the maintenance of their culture is often important for psychological, social and also political reasons (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). Theoretically, culture maintenance does not have to be in opposition to cultural adaptation. It is possible that these are two relatively independent processes which might result in bi-cultural positions. Members of ethnic minority groups not only belong to their own ethnic group, they also have to deal with the majority group of the society in which they live. Hence, for them it is often difficult to conceive of culture maintenance and cultural adaptation as mutually exclusive matters. A two-dimensional model makes a combination of culture maintenance and adaptation possible, resulting in four different forms of acculturation (Berry, 1980; Bochner, 1982). Assimilation or one-sided adaptation to the dominant culture without preservation of one's own minority culture is one of these forms. The opposite of assimilation is separation, or the one-sided maintenance of minority culture without a focus on the dominant culture. In addition to these two forms, integration refers to that form of acculturation which favors culture maintenance as well as adaptation and contact, whereas marginalization refers to the rejection of both cultures.

Several studies have used this two-dimensional model (Berry, Trimble, & Olmedo, 1996; Horenczyk, 1996; Hutnik, 1991; Sanchez & Fernandez, 1993; Taylor & Lambert, 1996), and Kemper (1996), Prins (1996), Vollebergh and Huiberts (1996), and Verkuyten and Kwa (1994) have used this model in their studies of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. In general, these Dutch studies show that separation and integration are the most frequently used forms of acculturation, and that assimilation and marginalization tend to be exceptional (for a review see Verkuyten, 1999). Furthermore, these studies suggest that ethnic minorities perceive culture maintenance and cultural adaptation as two relatively independent issues.

We expected (H1) Turkish youth to stress the importance of culture maintenance by minority groups, whereas the Dutch, as majority group, were expected to agree less with culture maintenance by minority groups and more with cultural adaptation of these groups. Furthermore, we expected (H2) for the Turks no relation between culture maintenance and cultural adaptation, whereas a negative association was expected between culture maintenance and cultural adaptation of ethnic minorities among the Dutch.

3. Ethnic identification

In an acculturation framework, ethnic identification is often considered to be an aspect of psychological acculturation (Berry & Sam, 1996). However, ethnic identification is also examined and found to be independent of other aspects of acculturation (Hutnik, 1991; Phinney, 1990; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). People from ethnic groups may become culturally assimilated to a great extent while yet maintaining a strong sense of ethnic belonging. So the process of self-identification need not necessarily undergo a similar change (e.g. Hutnik, 1991). An individual can still strongly identify with his or her ethnic minority group while he/she has made important cultural adaptations for effective living.

According to SIT, being a minority group member is a threat to a positive social identity. People respond to this threat by accentuating positively valued differences and with stronger in-group identification (e.g. Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). Ethnic minorities can emphasize the value and self-defining importance of their ethnic background in reaction to negative characterizations. In agreement with this explanation, several studies among different ethnic groups in different countries have shown that, on average, youth from ethnic minorities identify more strongly with their ethnic group, than majority group members do (see Phinney, 1990). Furthermore, more than six different studies among Turkish, Moroccan and Surinamese youth in the Netherlands found this stronger identification to be coupled with feelings of pride and satisfaction concerning ethnic identity (see Verkuyten, 1999). Hence, we expected (H3) Turkish youth to identify more strongly with their ethnic background than their Dutch contemporaries.

The more people identify with their own ethnic group, the more likely they will consider it important to preserve their own culture. For minorities, this means that we can expect (H4) a positive association between culture maintenance and ethnic identification. However, the relationship between ethnic identification and cultural adaptation is less clear. Empirical evidence shows that the association between adaptation to the majority group culture and ethnic identification is non-existent or even positive. For example, several studies among ethnic minorities in the Netherlands found that a preference for one's ethnic group is not associated with a rejection of other groups (see Verkuyten, 1999). On the contrary, for many minority group members a positive in-group attitude is accompanied by a positive attitude towards the Dutch. A similar result has been found in other countries. Phinney, Ferguson, and Tate (1997), for example, present a path model for explaining the attitude towards the majority group. Among several ethnic minority groups in the United States, ethnic identification appears to positively influence the attitude towards the in-group, which consequently affects the attitude towards the majority group in a positive way. A similar result has been found among adolescents from ethnic minorities in the Netherlands (Verkuyten, 1992). LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) identify this positive attitude towards both groups as an important feature of bi-cultural competence that can reduce feelings of cultural conflict and adjustment-related stress.

Among Dutch youth, in-group preference is often related to the rejection of ethnic minorities. Furthermore, not only is ethnic identification found to be positively related to their attitude towards their in-group, but also to the rejection of ethnic minority groups (Verkuyten, 1992, 1999). Dutch people often see ethnic minorities as a threat to society and Dutch culture. SIT argues that not all group members respond to perceived threat with a rejection of out-groups. The reaction depends on the degree of identification. Those who value Dutch identity are more likely to reject the idea of cultural maintenance of ethnic minorities and will probably be more in favor of cultural adaptation. Hence, for the Dutch we expected (H5) ethnic identification to be positively related to their attitude towards the adaptation of ethnic minorities to Dutch culture, and negatively to their attitude towards minorities' maintenance of their culture.

4. Group discrimination

The social position acquired by ethnic minorities and the different forms of adaptation they adhere to, are certainly not only dependent on their own choices. For a minority group member, Dutch society's reaction to the presence of ethnic minorities is part of the perceived treatment or reception-side of the acculturation process (Berry & Sam, 1996). The receiving society can be seen as offering more or less opportunities, as culturally open or closed, and as accepting or discriminating towards minority groups. The extent to which minorities feel accepted or discriminated against as a group may affect their attitude towards culture maintenance and cultural adaptation (Horenczyk, 1996).

Furthermore, according to SIT, the perception of discrimination of in-group members or 'group-discrimination' may be related to ethnic identification. Discrimination confronting people from the in-group, is threatening, in particular for those who identify with their ethnic minority group.

In the present study, we examine perceived group discrimination as a form of social identity threat.¹ This focus on the group level is in agreement with our questions on culture maintenance and adjustment that are also on this level. For the Turkish youth, we expected group discrimination to be positively related to ethnic identification (H6) and to culture maintenance (H7). Whether there would be an association between group discrimination and adaptation to Dutch culture was not clear, but a negative correlation seemed plausible.

Most social psychological studies examining attribution processes distinguish between internal and external attributions. People can give explanations stressing characteristics of themselves or their in-group (internal attributions), but may do so

¹In several studies it has been concluded that people report less discrimination directed against themselves than against their group. Taylor, Wright, and Porter (1993) refer to this phenomenon as the 'personal/group discrepancy of discrimination' and they discuss several explanations for it. In the Netherlands this discrepancy has also been found among adolescents from different ethnic minority groups (Verkuyten, 1998).

by stressing characteristics of circumstances or others (external attributions). Hence, not only group discrimination but also the explanation given for it is of importance. It is plausible that ethnic minorities attribute group discrimination mainly to external causes. Similar to other countries, in the Netherlands majority group members are often in a position to discriminate and they often do so (Bovenkerk, Gras, & Ramsoedh, 1995).

However, an external attribution of discrimination is not self-evident. Such an explanation implies that the control over one's own life is in part defined as being in the hands of others (Ruggiero & Taylor, 1995, 1997). This explanation assigns a victim role to one's own group, which is difficult to reconcile with the idea of societal opportunities and claims to self-determination. Hence, Turks who strive for integration and success in Dutch society have been found to explain existing group discrimination by referring to the behavior of people from their own group (Verkuyten, 1999).² This leads us to expect (H8) that a stronger internal attribution when accounting for group discrimination is related to an emphasis on adaptation to Dutch culture, and probably also to a less strong ethnic identification. We were unsure whether there would be an association with culture maintenance.

Internal attribution and frequency of in-group discrimination were also measured among Dutch youth. This allowed us to compare both groups. However, there is another reason for measuring group discrimination among the Dutch. The reality of everyday life in multi-ethnic schools and neighborhoods is not always in agreement with the common perception that the Dutch discriminate and ethnic minorities are discriminated against. Leeman (1994) shows that young people can question this view because it does not fit their experiences. Discrimination also occurs between and within ethnic minorities and can also be directed against the Dutch. It is unclear, however, to what extent this occurs and to what extent perceived discrimination influences Dutch adolescents' attitudes towards culture maintenance by and cultural adaptation of minority groups. However, compared to the Turks, Dutch adolescents will probably perceive less group discrimination. It is difficult to argue whether there will be a difference with respect to the attribution of perceived in-group discrimination.

To summarize, the following expectations derived from our discussion, will be examined. First, we anticipated that, compared to the Dutch, Turkish adolescents would stress the importance of cultural maintenance by minority groups more strongly, and would place less emphasis on adaptation to the Dutch culture (H1). Second, we expected cultural maintenance and culture adaptation to be relatively independent dimensions for the Turks, whereas for the Dutch a negative correlation was expected (H2). Third, compared to the Dutch, the Turks should evaluate their ethnic identity more positively (H3), and also will report more in-group discrimination, and make fewer attributions of in-group responsibility for this

²If such an explanation is combined with dis-identification with the in-group, than it may be more correct to talk about an external group attribution instead of an internal one. Here, however, the focus is on ethnic identification and not dis-identification. Identification can be relatively weak but this does not imply dis-identification (Verkuyten, 1999).

discrimination. Fourth, for the Turks a positive relationship between ethnic identification and culture maintenance was expected (H4), and the relationship between identification and cultural adaptation was explored. In contrast, for the Dutch a positive relation between their ethnic identification and the adaptation of minority groups to their culture was expected, as well as a negative correlation between identification and culture maintenance (H5). Fifth, particularly among the Turks, perceived in-group discrimination was expected to be related to cultural maintenance (H6) and to ethnic identification (H7). Sixth, for the Turks, in-group attribution of group discrimination will be related to an emphasis on adaptation to Dutch culture (H8). Finally, we looked for any differences related to gender, age and educational level, making it possible to explore the relevance of these characteristics, and to control for them when testing our expectations.

5. Method

5.1. Participants

The study was conducted in ten multi-ethnic secondary schools in different parts of the Netherlands. The questionnaires were administered in the classroom under supervision. Students completed the questionnaire anonymously. We focused on Dutch and Turkish adolescents with parents of the same ethnic background.³ On an open-ended question concerning their ethnicity, 412 students described themselves as Dutch and 161 as Turkish. Of these students, 54% were females and 46% males. This gender distribution was the same for Dutch and Turkish students (chi-square = 2.00, $p > 0.10$). Participants were between 13 and 16 years of age and their mean age was 14.4. Of the Turkish students 60% were 15–16 years old, for the Dutch this was 40% (chi-square = 17.64, $p < 0.001$). 73% of the total sample attended general secondary education (Vmbo: vocational training), and 27% attended professional and academic secondary education (Havo/Vwo), respectively. More Turkish (84%) than Dutch (69%) participants attended general secondary education (chi-square = 13.78, $p < .001$).

5.2. Measures

Both ‘cultural adaptation’ and ‘culture maintenance’ were measured by a single item adapted from Taylor and Lambert (1996). For ‘adaptation’ the item was ‘Every ethnic minority group should adapt to Dutch culture’. For culture maintenance the item was ‘Every ethnic minority group needs to maintain its own culture as much as possible’. The items were scored using the Likert-method, with scores ranging from ‘No, certainly not’ (1) to ‘Yes, certainly’ (5).

³ Participants from other ethnic groups were left out of the analyses. Their numbers were too small for meaningful statistical analyses. The same applies to the 15 participants who indicated that they had a Turkish father and a Dutch mother.

Ethnic identification was measured using seven items adapted from Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) that have been used in other Dutch studies (e.g. Verkuyten, 1995). Three sample items are ‘I see myself as a typical Turkish/Dutch person’, ‘I am proud to be a Turkish/Dutch person’ and ‘I often dislike being Turkish/Dutch’ (reverse coded). The same five-point scale was used. Cronbach’s alpha was 0.76 for the Dutch and 0.80 for the Turkish participants.

In-group discrimination was measured using three items explicitly measuring the extent to which people from the in-group are confronted with discrimination in three different situations. These questions were derived from Ruggiero and Taylor (1995) and have been used in earlier studies in the Netherlands (Verkuyten, 1998; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999). A sample item is ‘Are people from your ethnic group ever discriminated against, when looking for a job?’. The other two items concerned ‘going out or sport’ and ‘in streets or shops’. Participants could respond using a five-point scale, ranging from ‘Never’ (1) to ‘Always’ (5). Reliability analysis yielded an alpha equal to 0.83 for the Dutch and 0.81 for the Turks.

Attribution of in-group discrimination was measured using two items, each with a five-point scale. The two items were, ‘That people from my ethnic group are discriminated against, is mainly due to the people who discriminate’ (reverse coded), and, ‘That people from my ethnic group are discriminated against, is also due to their own behavior’. The composite score of these two items was used as a measure for attribution, and a higher score indicated a stronger internal group attribution. For these two items, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.77 for the Dutch and 0.65 for the Turkish participants.

6. Results

In order to see whether the mean scores differed, factorial analyses of variance (ANOVA’s) were performed with four factors: ethnicity (Dutch/Turkish), gender, age (13–14/15–16) and education level (low/high). Table 1 shows for the different measures the adjusted means for ethnicity, that is the mean scores when statistically

Table 1

Adjusted means and standard deviations for the different measures: Dutch ($N = 412$) and Turkish ($N = 161$) adolescents^a

	Dutch		Turks		F-value	Eta
	M	SD	M	SD		
Cultural adaptation	3.01	1.14	2.44	1.27	27.53***	0.21
Culture maintenance	3.18	0.96	4.28	0.91	150.56***	0.47
Ethnic identification	3.54	0.63	3.92	0.69	48.95***	0.32
In-group discrimination	1.82	0.68	2.40	0.87	64.75***	0.33
Internal in-group attribution discrimination	2.68	0.74	2.40	0.80	15.35***	0.17

^a Note: *** $p < 0.001$.

controlled for gender, age, and education level. Clear significant and relatively strong (eta-value) differences between Dutch and Turkish participants emerged on all measures.

In agreement with the first hypothesis, the results show that the Dutch were more in favor of adaptation than Turkish contemporaries. On average the answer of the Dutch adolescents fell between 'no' and 'yes', whereby 33% argued that ethnic minority groups should adapt to Dutch culture and 26% did not agree with this. The mean score for the Turkish students was on the 'no'-side of the scale: 25% agreed with the 'adaptation' position, whereas 49% did not. The analysis yielded two other effects. Males more than females thought that every ethnic minority group should adapt to Dutch culture, $F(1572) = 12.72$, $p < 0.001$. Those in general secondary education (low level) were also more likely to think this, compared to those in professional or academic education (high level), $F(1571) = 29.91$, $p < 0.001$. There was no effect for age on this or on any of the other measures. There were also no significant higher order interaction-effects between the four factors.

The analysis revealed a very strong difference between Dutch and Turkish adolescents on 'culture maintenance'. Dutch participants scored around the mid-point of the scale, whereas the Turks were clearly of the opinion that every ethnic minority group should maintain its own culture as much as possible. 35% of the Dutch favored culture maintenance by ethnic minorities and 20% were against it. 80% of the Turkish students were in favor and 3% were against. There were no significant effects for gender or education level, and there were no significant interaction effects.

As can be seen in Table 1 both Dutch and Turkish students favored 'culture maintenance' more than 'adaptation'. Pairwise comparison revealed a significant difference for both groups, but this difference was clearly greater for the Turks, $t(410) = 2.30$, $p < 0.05$ for the Dutch and $t(160) = 12.92$, $p < 0.001$ for the Turks.

Table 2 shows that the correlation between both measures also differed between Dutch and Turkish participants, and the pattern of results supports the second hypothesis. For the Dutch this correlation was negative. For them 'adaptation' and 'culture maintenance' appear to be two conflicting issues. The Turks see no such dichotomous relationship, for them these are two relatively independent dimensions.

6.1. Group identification

Table 1 also shows that Turkish adolescents had a more positive attitude towards their ethnic identity compared to the Dutch. This is in agreement with the third hypothesis. Furthermore, males valued their ethnic identity more than females, $F(1572) = 8.02$, $p < 0.001$, and adolescents attending general secondary education valued their ethnic identity more than those following professional and academic secondary education, $F(1569) = 14.94$, $p < 0.001$.

The correlations in Table 2 support the fourth hypothesis in showing that Turkish ethnic identification was positively related to culture maintenance. Turkish adolescents who value their ethnic background are more in favor of ethnic minorities maintaining their own culture. For the Turks, adaptation was not

Table 2

Product-moment correlates between the different measures. Dutch participants above the diagonal and Turkish participants below the diagonal^a

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Cultural adaptation	—	−0.51***	0.29***	0.02	−0.03
2. Culture maintenance	−0.16*	—	−0.21**	0.05	0.03
3. Ethnic identification	−0.12	0.34***	—	−0.06	−0.05
4. In-group discrimination	−0.02	−0.24***	0.07	—	0.09
5. Attribution discrimination	0.27***	−0.14	−0.29***	−0.16*	—

^a Note: ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

significantly related to ethnic identification. In contrast and as expected (H5) the ethnic identity of the Dutch participants was positively related to ethnic minority group's adaptation to Dutch culture and negatively to cultural maintenance. Dutch adolescents with a more positive ethnic identity are more in favor of adaptation of ethnic minority groups and are less in favor of cultural maintenance by ethnic minority groups.

6.2. Group discrimination

Between the Turks and Dutch participants, clear differences emerged for in-group discrimination and the internal attribution of this discrimination (Table 1). Turkish adolescents reported more discrimination against Turks than Dutch adolescents reported discrimination against Dutch. Furthermore, the Turks attributed the reasons for discrimination less to their in-group than the Dutch did. Another significant main effect was that males reported more in-group discrimination than females, $F(1572) = 4.45$, $p < 0.05$. Also, for in-group discrimination there was a significant interaction effect between ethnic background and education level, $F \times (1571) = 5.11$, $p < 0.05$. Especially Turks attending general secondary education reported more group discrimination than other participants.

Only among the Turks were there significant correlations between perceived in-group discrimination and the internal attribution of this discrimination. More group discrimination was related to fewer internal attributions, and to a greater preference for culture maintenance (H6). Furthermore, ethnic identification was associated with a less strong internal attribution for discrimination (H7). Finally and in agreement with our last hypothesis, cultural adaptation was favored more when the reason for the discrimination was attributed to the behavior of the Turks themselves. To gain a better understanding of these associations multiple regression analyses were performed for the Turkish and Dutch students separately.

6.3. Regression analyses

Stepwise hierarchical regression analyses was used to determine which variables independently predicted the two criterion variables: the attitude towards adaptation

to Dutch culture and towards minority culture maintenance. For these analyses we constructed a dummy variable for gender, whereby 0 = 'male' and 1 = 'female'. We did the same for age and for education level: 0 = 'low' and 1 = 'high'. In these analyses, gender and education level were included as predictors in the first step. In the second step, ethnic identification, perceived group discrimination, and the attribution of group discrimination were added. In the third step, the three interaction terms between the three (centered) continuous variables were included in the regression equation.⁴ Table 3 shows the results of these analyses for the Turkish adolescents.

For cultural adaptation as the criterion variable, in the first step, gender and education level were not significant predictors. A significant part of the total variance was explained by adding ethnic identification, group discrimination and attribution to the equation in the second step. However, only the attribution of in-group discrimination appeared to be a significant predictor of cultural adaptation. Turkish adolescents who attributed discrimination more strongly to their in-group tended to agree more with the need for cultural adaptation. The inclusion of the three interaction terms led to a significant change in the total amount of explained variance. The interaction between ethnic identification and attribution of discrimination appeared to be a significant predictor, and the main effect of attribution was no longer significant. The interaction effect was investigated using simple slope analysis (Aiken & West, 1991). With 'adaptation' as the dependent variable and under the condition of high ethnic identification, the simple slope or unstandardized regression coefficient for internal attribution was 0.24 ($p < 0.05$). When identification was low this coefficient was 0.01 ($p > 0.10$). Hence, Turkish participants who identify with their ethnic group and attribute in-group discrimination to external causes agree the least with cultural adaptation.

Gender and educational level were also not significant predictors of culture maintenance (Table 3). In the second step, ethnic identification appeared to be an independent predictor of the attitude towards ethnic minority culture maintenance. Turkish students endorsed culture maintenance more strongly when they identified with their ethnic background. The inclusion of the interactions in the regression equation yielded a significant change in the amount of explained variance. Especially the interaction between ethnic identification and group discrimination proved to be a significant predictor of 'culture maintenance'. We investigated this interaction by performing simple slope analysis. With culture maintenance as the dependent variable and when ethnic identification was high, the regression coefficient for group discrimination was -0.05 ($p > 0.10$). Under the condition of low identification this coefficient was 0.41 ($p < 0.01$). Thus, when ethnic identification was strong, in-group discrimination was not related to the attitude towards minority groups maintaining their own cultures. When ethnic identification was low, however, a positive relation between discrimination and 'culture maintenance' existed.

⁴We also examined whether there were any significant three-way interaction effects. This was not the case.

Table 3

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses with cultural adaptation and culture maintenance as dependent variables. Standardized regression coefficients (beta) for the Turkish adolescents^a

	'Adaptation'			'Maintenance'		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Female	–0.12	–0.10	–0.09	0.01	0.03	0.04
Low education	–0.11	–0.13	–0.10	0.02	0.02	0.01
Ethnic identification		–0.07	–0.09		0.37**	0.33**
In-group discrimination		0.09	0.11		0.15	0.11
Internal attribution discrimination		0.22**	0.13		–0.02	–0.03
Identification × discrimination			0.06			–0.30**
Identification × attribution			0.24**			0.03
Discrimination × attribution			0.10			–0.16
Multiple <i>r</i>	0.17	0.30	0.39	0.02	0.42	0.49
<i>r</i> -square change		0.06*	0.07*		0.17**	0.06*
<i>F</i> -value	2.04	2.51**	2.81*	0.03	5.60***	4.47***

^a Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

The same stepwise regression analyses were conducted for the Dutch adolescents. For 'cultural adaptation' the total amount of variance explained was significant after the third step: multiple $r = 0.36$ and $F = 6.53$, $p < 0.001$. Two predictors had an independent effect. Dutch adolescents attending general secondary education agreed more strongly that ethnic minority groups should adapt to Dutch culture (standardized beta = -0.21 , $p < 0.001$). The same held for Dutch adolescents with a positively valued ethnic identity (beta = 0.22 , $p < 0.001$).

For 'culture maintenance' the total amount of variance explained was also significant after the third step: multiple $r = 0.24$, $F = 2.76$, $p < 0.001$. Ethnic identification was the only significant negative predictor (beta = -0.18 , $p < 0.01$).

7. Discussion

Using SIT and the acculturation model outlined by Berry (1980), the present study addressed the question whether majority (Dutch) and minority (Turks) group adolescents think that ethnic minorities should maintain their own culture and/or should adapt to Dutch culture. Dutch and Turkish adolescents belong to groups with different social positions in society. Dutch people often see the presence of ethnic minorities as a threat. The desire of those groups to maintain their own culture is easily conceived of as a lack of adjustment indicative of distance or even separation from Dutch society (van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Prins, 1996). Therefore we expected Dutch adolescents to prefer cultural adaptation over culture maintenance by minorities, and furthermore that these would be seen as

contradictory. The situation is different for Turkish adolescents. For them cultural adaptation is important if they are to acquire a position in Dutch society, but culture maintenance is also important for social and psychological reasons. In such a situation it is neither very practical nor realistic to view culture maintenance and adaptation as mutually exclusive options. Rather, it is to be expected that Turkish adolescents would emphasize the importance of both.

The results support these expectations. Dutch adolescents clearly favored adjustment more than the Turks. For 'culture maintenance' the difference was even stronger. The vast majority of the Turkish adolescents emphasized the importance of culture maintenance by ethnic minorities, while Dutch adolescents did so to a much smaller degree. These results indicate that difference in opinion between Dutch and Turkish adolescent lies in their attitudes towards culture maintenance of ethnic minorities, and less in their attitudes towards adaptation.

Among the Dutch adolescents, both attitudes were negatively related. As expected, for them culture maintenance was more or less in opposition to adaptation to Dutch culture. Both attitudes seemed irreconcilable, suggesting the necessity of a choice. This was not the case for the Turkish adolescents. This difference between the groups suggests that issues of culture maintenance and adaptation have different meanings for Dutch and Turkish adolescents.

SIT predicts that especially Dutch adolescents with a strong ethnic identification will view culture maintenance by ethnic minorities as something threatening to society and their identity. This appeared to be the case. Among Dutch adolescents, identification with their own group was negatively related to their attitude towards culture maintenance by minorities and positively to the attitude towards cultural adjustment.

Also consistent with SIT and with other Dutch studies (see Verkuyten, 1999), is the finding that Turkish adolescents as members of a minority groups identified more strongly with their ethnic background than did their Dutch contemporaries. SIT argues that stronger in-group identification is a response to a threat to a positive social identity that a minority position implies (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999).⁵ Furthermore, amongst the Turks ethnic identification was positively related to 'culture maintenance'. Turkish adolescents with a strong in-group identification placed a greater importance on culture maintenance. Thus, the attitude towards culture maintenance depended on ethnic identification. When ethnic identification was relatively low it also depended on the extent to which Turkish people were perceived to be discriminated against.

In contrast to the Dutch, ethnic identification among the Turkish adolescents was not related to their attitude towards cultural adaptation. This difference between the groups has practical implications. It suggests that stimulating acceptance of other

⁵ However, other explanations are also possible. For example, Hutnik (1991) has argued that many ethnic minority groups have their own rich history, culture and traditions. These are important sources for developing pride and satisfaction in one's ethnic background or a positive ethnic identity. Thus, strong ethnic identification among minority group members may not only be a reaction to perceived exclusion (Roosens, 1994).

groups as well as a positive ethnic identity would be especially difficult to do among the Dutch. For them, a more positive ethnic identity is related to an emphasis on adaptation of ethnic minorities and a less favorable view of culture maintenance by minorities. For the Turkish adolescents the situation is different. For them there is no contrast between a positive identification with their ethnic background and the extent to which they favored 'adaptation'. However, taking the attribution of in-group discrimination into account qualifies this conclusion.

Among the Turkish adolescents, ethnic identification was positively related to an external attribution of group discrimination. As expected, this external attribution was also related to less emphasis on cultural adaptation. Agreement with 'cultural adaptation' was lowest, however, among Turkish adolescents who strongly identified with their ethnic background as well as attributed discrimination to the behavior of out-group members. Turkish adolescents' attitudes towards culture maintenance and cultural adaptation were determined not only by their ethnic identification but also by their perception and interpretation of discrimination against members of their own group. The emotional ties with the in-group as well as the extent to which society was perceived to accept or discriminate against minorities affected Turkish adolescents thinking on multiculturalism. Hence, in agreement with SIT, perceived discrimination and in-group identification are two central factors to consider in studying acculturation processes among minority group members.

We also found some differences related to gender and education level. Males more than females stressed the importance of adaptation to Dutch culture and they had stronger ethnic identification. Such gender differences have been found in different studies in several countries (see Bat-Chava & Steen, 1997; Phinney, 1990). A possible explanation is that, compared to females, males are more focused on group status and prestige in general, and prestige in relation to ethnic groups in particular. Moreover, males take part in competitive activities based on group membership more frequently than females, who tend to belong to small groups based on shared interests and interpersonal preferences (Schofield, 1981).

Compared to students in professional and academic secondary education (higher level), those in general secondary schools (lower level) favored 'cultural adaptation' more and they also had a stronger ethnic identification. This emphasis on 'adaptation' existed especially among the Dutch. Numerous studies in several countries have found that education level has a positive influence on the attitude of majority groups towards minorities (see Hagendoorn & Nekuee, 1999). More higher educated people have a more open attitude towards other cultures and more developed cognitive abilities for to handling differences and complexities in a competent way. These abilities might also explain why Turkish adolescents attending professional and academic secondary education reported more discrimination of their ethnic group.

We would like to emphasize three characteristics important to the interpretation of the results. First, attitudes towards culture maintenance and cultural adaptation were investigated in a general sense. It is possible, however, that these attitudes are partly dependent on social situations. Culture maintenance in the private sphere, for

example, is seen as far less problematic by the Dutch who see ‘adaptation’ as something concerning public life in particular (Verkuyten, 1997). Also, Taylor and Lambert (1996) made a distinction between private spheres, public spheres in which ethnic minorities are the numerical majority and public spheres in which they are the minority. They found that both minority and majority groups favored culture maintenance in the private sphere, while the need for cultural adjustment was stressed in numerical minority situations. Therefore, the specific situation can be of importance for attitudes towards culture maintenance and cultural adaptation of ethnic minorities.

Second, in discussing the perceived necessities of culture maintenance and adaptation to Dutch culture we have implicitly presented cultures as ‘objects’ related to specific groups. We borrow this essentialist and reified use of the term ‘culture’ from its everyday use in discussions about multicultural societies in the media, politics and daily life (e.g. Baumann, 1996). It also corresponds to popular conceptions, for example, of ethnic minority adolescents living in or between two cultures. Therefore this study provides insight into people’s everyday opinions. However, it should be noted that this representation of cultures obscures the interactive, reflexive and conflicting character of cultures. Cultures are interactive because norms and practices are adjusted and (re)confirmed in daily life. People are not merely passive carriers of culture, they are also involved in the continuous construction of new meanings. Furthermore, cultures have numerous rules, convictions and values permitting divergent and conflicting interpretations. Often, cultural meanings are not self-evident, but are objects of debate and negotiation. From a cultural point of view everything is not in motion to the same extent. Culture has structural and continuous characteristics, like values and language. At the same time there are ongoing changes in which cultural characteristics are used, mixed and transformed in relation to the circumstances in which people live.

It is also worth pointing out that our study focused on issues of culture maintenance and cultural adaptation for ethnic minority groups. The question whether Dutch people should adapt to other cultures was not asked. Thus, implicitly we took the position of the Dutch as given. It can be argued, again, that this emphasis on ethnic minorities corresponds with the dominant representations and discussions in society. It should be stressed, however, that every approach has its particular consequences. By restricting the object of this study the way we did, no insight was gained into the attitudes Dutch people and ethnic minorities have towards cultural adaptation and maintenance of the Dutch. For example, both groups may equally strong emphasize the importance of maintaining their own culture. In addition, ethnic minorities may reject cultural maintenance or enhancement of the Dutch, similar to the way the Dutch reject cultural maintenance among minority groups.

Third, some methodological qualifications should be considered. A correlation study was conducted which means that the causal direction of the effects cannot be determined. The focus was on predicting attitudes towards cultural maintenance and cultural adaptation of ethnic minority groups. However, these attitudes may, for

example, also affect ethnic identification or the perception of group discrimination and the way discrimination is explained. In addition, cultural adaptation and cultural maintenance were measured with single items. Although clear and consistent results were found future studies should try to develop additional items. Furthermore, the study was conducted among adolescents. The focus on adolescents is important. In a world that is rapidly becoming multicultural, they are in the process of developing a more secure and mature sense of themselves and an orientation towards others. However, studies with older participants as well as with children are needed in order to assess whether the theoretical framework and results can be applied more generally.

To summarize, we have examined the attitudes towards multiculturalism among both majority and minority group adolescents. We found considerable differences between majority and minority group members in their attitudes towards minority culture maintenance and adaptation to the ways of the dominant culture. The results of this study support the idea that more empirical research into multicultural issues is needed. This research could focus on divergent aspects of multiculturalism, such as the importance of social context and the desirability of mutual adjustments. Furthermore, this research should address other countries and other ethnic minority groups, as well as other age categories and other possibly important background-characteristics, like socio-economic status, migration background and length of residence.

References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bat-Chava, Y., & Steen, E. M. (1997). *Ethnic identity and self-esteem: A meta-analytic review*. New York: New York State University.
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1997). *Social psychology* (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Baumann, G. (1996). *Contesting culture: Discourses of identity in multi-ethnic London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. L. (1996). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, social behavior and applications* (2nd ed.), Vol. 3. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In S. Bocher (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369–386.
- Bovenkerk, F., Gras, M. J. I., & Ramsøedh, D. (1995). *Discrimination against migrant workers and ethnic minorities in access to employment in the Netherlands*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35–58). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (Eds.). (1999). *Social identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Hagendoorn, L., & Hraba, J. (1989). Foreign, different, deviant, seclusive and working class: Anchors to an ethnic hierarchy in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 12, 441–468.
- Hagendoorn, L., & Nekuee, S. (1999). *Education and racism: A cross-national inventory of positive effects of education on ethnic tolerance*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Horenczyk, G. (1996). Migrant identities in conflict: Acculturation attitudes and perceived acculturation ideologies. In G. M. Breakwell, & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities: Social psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 241–250). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hutnik, N. (1991). *Ethnic minority identity*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Kemper, F. (1996). *Religiositeit, etniciteit en welbevinden bij mannen van de eerste generatie Marokkaanse moslimmigranten*. Nijmegen: Dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 395–412.
- Leeman, Y. (1994). *Samen jong: Nederlandse jongeren en lessen over inter-etnisch samenleven en discriminatie*. Utrecht: Jan van Arkel.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 302–318.
- Oudenhoven, van, Prins, J. P., & Buunk, K. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 995–1013.
- Phinney, J. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: A review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 499–514.
- Phinney, J. S., Ferguson, D. L., & Tate, J. D. (1997). Intergroup attitudes among ethnic minority adolescents: A causal model. *Child Development*, 68, 955–969.
- Prins, K. (1996). *Van 'gastarbeider' tot 'Nederlander': Adaptatie van Marokkanen en Turken in Nederland*. Groningen: Dissertation Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Roosens, E. (1994). The primordial nature of origins in migrant ethnicity. In H. Vermeulen, & C. Govers (Eds.), *The anthropology of ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic groups and boundaries* (pp. 81–104). Amsterdam: Spinhuis.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1995). Coping with discrimination: How disadvantaged group members perceive discrimination that confronts them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 826–838.
- Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1997). When minority members perceive or do not perceive the discrimination that confronts them: The role of self-esteem and perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 373–389.
- Sanchez, J. I., & Fernandez, D. M. (1993). Acculturative stress among Hispanics: A bidimensional model of ethnic identification. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 654–668.
- Schofield, J. W. (1981). Complementary and conflicting identities: Images and interaction in an interracial school. In S. R. Asher, & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), *The development of children's friendships* (pp. 53–74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, D. M., & Lambert, W. E. (1996). The meaning of multiculturalism in a culturally diverse urban American area. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 727–740.
- Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). *Theories of intergroup relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Taylor, D. M., Wright, S. C., & Porter, L. E. (1993). Dimensions of perceived discrimination: The personal/group discrimination discrepancy. In M. P. Zanna, & J. M. Olson, *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium*, (Vol. 7) (pp. 233–255). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Verkuyten, M. (1992). Ethnic group preferences and the evaluation of ethnic identity among adolescents in the Netherlands. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 132, 741–750.
- Verkuyten, M. (1995). Self-esteem, self-concept stability, and aspects of ethnic identity among minority and majority youth in the Netherlands. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 24, 115–175.
- Verkuyten, M. (1997). *'redelijk racism': Gesprekken over allochtonen in oude stadswijken*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

- Verkuyten, M. (1998). Perceived discrimination and self-esteem among ethnic minority adolescents. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 479–493.
- Verkuyten, M. (1999). *Etnische identiteit: theoretische en empirische benaderingen*. Amsterdam: Spinhuis.
- Verkuyten, M., & Kwa, I. (1994). Ethnic self-identification and psychological well-being among ethnic minority youth in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 5, 19–34.
- Verkuyten, M., & Nekuee, S. (1999). Ingroup bias: The effect of self-stereotyping, identification and group threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 411–418.
- Vollebergh, W. A. M., & Huiberts, A. (1996). Welbevinden en etnische identiteit bij allochtone jongeren. *Pedagogisch Tijdschrift*, 21, 357–372.
- Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and adaptation revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 422–442.